UM-DOE/ER/40762-526

Multi-channel S-matrices from energy levels in finite boxes

Evan Berkowitz,[*] Thomas D. Cohen,[†] and Patrick Jefferson[‡]
Maryland Center for Fundamental Physics
Department of Physics
University of Maryland, College Park, MD USA
November 13, 2012

We show that for a generic quantum mechanical system with more than one open scattering channel, it is not possible to fully reconstruct the theory's S-matrix from spectral information obtained in large finite volumes with periodic boundary conditions. Physically distinct S-matrices can have identical finite-volume spectra for large finite boxes of arbitrary sizes. If the theory is not time-reversal symmetric, there exists an uncountably infinite set of distinct S-matrices with the same spectra. If the theory respects time-reversal symmetry there exists a discrete set of S-matrices with identical energy levels for finite boxes. We illustrate the issue for simple quantum mechanical systems in 1+1 dimensions.

arXiv:1211.2261v1 [hep-lat] 9 Nov 2012

I. INTRODUCTION

Because it is strongly coupled at low energy, quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is not amenable to perturbative techniques there. Fortunately, lattice simulations provide a first-principles technique for extracting predictions from the theory. The lattice has achieved unprecedented accuracy for many QCD observables, including some that are difficult to extract experimentally[1]. Indeed, it has become a precision tool for many purposes. However, not all QCD observables are easily accessible via lattice simulations. One important class of these are scattering observables in regimes where there is more than one open channel.

Before early groundbreaking work[2–7] it was not generally understood that at least some types of scattering information are accessible via finite-volume lattice studies, which by construction always yield a discrete spectrum of energy levels. Now it is well-understood that in cases where the kinematics restrict the scattering to a single two-body scattering channel, one can extract the phase-shift for the channel given knowledge of the energy levels in a finite box. In particular given a sufficiently large box, knowledge of the size of the box, and the energy eigenlevels in that box, one can extract phase-shifts for those energies. By scanning through different box sizes—and thus different energies—one can extract the phase shift as a function of energy. This approach has already proven to be practical for cases of low-energy scattering[8–11]. However, this technique, usually referred to as "Lüscher's formula", only provides access to certain kinds of data. It does not apply in its original form to situations in which there is more than one accessible channel.

This difficulty is acute for the problem of hadron spectroscopy, a subject in which there has been considerable interest from the lattice community [9, 12–22]. The difficulty is that the vast majority of hadrons are resonances above the three-body threshold for which the original formulation of the Lüscher formula is inapplicable. The current state of the art for high-lying resonances is simply to calculate in a given relatively small box size and to identify the resonance's mass with an energy level. Such a procedure is presumably a valid way to identify the position of the resonance in the limit of an infinitely narrow resonance and in a regime where the box size is large enough to avoid large finite volume effects. However, the hadrons of physical interest typically have fairly substantial widths so this procedure is questionable. Moreover, the "mass" of a resonance is a quantity which depends on how one separates peaks from background in scattering data; such separation inherently creates model dependency. It would be far preferable to have access directly to the scattering observables in the form of the S-matrix directly from the lattice. This would enable one to make contact with the physics associated with hadronic widths and branching ratios.

The need for going beyond a simple association of a hadron's mass with the energy of a resonance is particularly clear in cases where the width of a resonance is large and multiple channels are involved. A good example is the Roper resonance: although it has a low excitation energy, it is quite broad and is strongly coupled to the nucleon plus two pion channel. The Roper resonance is surprisingly difficult to characterize experimentally and the width and branching ratios are poorly determined[23]. Thus for the Roper resonance, where an *ab initio* calculation of the scattering observables would be particularly helpful in trying to understand the nature of the state, a direct extraction of the mass from the energy on a single finite volume lattice is particularly difficult.

There are other cases where a direct extraction of the S-matrix is important. For example, in the on-going program to attempt to understand nuclear phenomena from QCD, low energy nuclear scattering observables are of interest. The ${}^1S_0$ channel in nucleon-nucleon scattering involves a single channel; it's S-matrix is fully characterized by a phase shift and the Lüscher formula directly

---

[*] Electronic address: evanb@umd.edu
[†] Electronic address: cohen@umd.edu
[‡] Electronic address: patrick.c.jefferson@gmail.com

applies. However, scattering in the deuteron channel is coupled and includes mixing between the ${}^3S_1$ and ${}^3D_1$ partial waves and the Lüscher formula does not directly apply. To proceed with the program of extracting nuclear physics from lattice QCD it is important to understand how to extract the S-matrix from the lattice.

There have been significant recent theoretical developments aimed at generalizing the Lüscher formula relating the energy levels in a finite box with periodic boundary conditions to many-channel S-matrices[24–27]. Underlying these works is the key insight behind the Lüscher formula: when the box is significantly larger than the range of interactions between the particles, then the particles are essentially non-interacting when they encounter the boundary conditions associated with the box. Thus the S-matrix alone determines whether the boundary conditions are met. One expects that complete knowledge of the S-matrix will determine the energy levels in the box.

This paper concentrates on the inverse problem: If one has access to the energy levels of a system computed on a set of finite boxes with periodic boundary conditions, can one reconstruct the full multi-channel S-matrix? This is the nature of the problem presented by lattice QCD. In the case of Lüscher's formula, in which only a single channel is relevant, this is straightforward. The existence of a bound state at a given energy is fixed by a single piece of information—the phase shift at that energy—which can be read off directly given knowledge of the box size. By working at a variety of box sizes which act to change the energies, one can then map out the phase shift as a function of energy. This is tantamount to learning the entire S-matrix. However in the multi-channel case, the S-matrix contains more than a single piece of information at one energy. It is thus not possible to determine a multi-channel S-matrix at a given energy from the knowledge of levels in a single finite box—even if the discrete energy levels in the box include the energy of interest.

Given this situation, it is immediately apparent that if it is possible to reconstruct the full S-matrix at all, it will necessarily involve extracting the energy levels from more than a single box. However, it is not immediately obvious whether it is possible to extract the S-matrix at a given energy even from the knowledge of energy levels in many different boxes. Note that, in the case of a single channel problem where the Lüscher formula holds, if one has two different box sizes which share a common energy level, they give redundant information: both boxes allow for the extraction of the same phase shift at that energy (up to finite volume corrections). It is by no means clear that in a multi-channel situation, where many parameters are needed specify the S-matrix, that different box sizes will also not give some redundant information in such a way as to prevent one from fully recovering the S-matrix. Indeed we will show that in general it is not possible, even in principle, to fully reconstruct the S-matrix at some given energy, even with a knowledge of the spectrum for an arbitrarily large number of distinct box sizes. In the general case, there exist physically distinct S-matrices which yield the same same spectra in any finite box subject to periodic boundary conditions.

This paper is aimed at clarifying issues of principle. Given this, it is useful to study the simplest context for which the issues arise. To do this we will make several important departures from the case of greatest interest—a system with 3+1 space-time dimensions, with fully relativistic kinematics and with any number of particles in the final state.

Instead, we confine our detailed studies to systems with 1+1 space-time dimensions. The full 3+1 dimensional problem is much more complicated technically. This complication arises from the fact that the free space theory is rotationally invariant, giving rise to a partial wave decomposition for the S-matrix, while the finite box only has a discrete subgroup of the rotations associated with the symmetries of a cube. However, it seems quite likely that the answers to the most fundamental questions of principle are not likely to depend on the number of space-time dimensions. It seems almost certain that if it turns out not to be possible to extract S-matrices from the finite volume data for 1+1 dimensional systems then it will not be possible for 3+1 dimensional systems. Thus, as a first step it is seems sensible to illustrate the impossibility of specifying the S-matrix using a simple 1+1 dimensional system.

In considering multi-channel S-matrices there are two qualitatively different kinematic regimes to consider. In one case, all of the channels involve two particles in the final state. In the case of QCD one might consider scattering between a pion and a strange baryon (Λ or Σ) in the $I = 1$ channel in the regime where both the π-Λ and π-Σ channels are kinematically accessible but below the threshold for the π-π-Λ channel. Thus, while there are multiple channels in such cases the S-matrix at any fixed energy can be fully specified by a discrete set of parameters. The other case is when the system is in a kinematical regime where there may be more than two particles in the final state. In this second case one needs to specify continuous functions to fully describe the S-matrix at a fixed energy. This second case is clearly more challenging. Again, our aim here is to keep things as simple as possible to illuminate the underlying issues. Thus, we will focus in this work on the first case—multiple channel problems with only two-particle final states.

Finally, the analysis of any particular problem depends on kinematical details. These simplify for the case of nonrelativistic kinematics. In the models studied in detail here we will restrict our attention to nonrelativistic systems, but our result easily generalizes to relativistic circumstances.

II. A GENERALIZED LÜSCHER FORMULA FOR A SIMPLE TOY PROBLEM

Consider the following nonrelativistic two-channel scattering problem in 1+1 space-time dimensions. Suppose that there are two possible channels; each one consists of two identical bosons of mass M but the particles in each of the two channels are different. These boson should be considered as composite objects with finite size—as mesons are in QCD. The energy in channel A is simply the kinetic energy while the energy in channel B is offset by an amount Δ. One can view Δ as the amount of energy needed to excite the two particles of type of A into those of type B. Since for simplicity the dynamics are nonrelativistic in both channels the excitation energy does not effect the mass: it must be conserved and thus is the same in both channels. As will be discussed later, the restriction to non-relativistic dynamics is inessential. The scattering problem consists of firing two particles of either type A or type B at each other and observing the outgoing particles which are either of the original type or through the interaction both converted to the other type. This problem does not correspond to any interesting physical system. However, it is a useful toy model for illustrating the relevant physics.

First consider the kinematic restrictions on S. By Galilean invariance we expect the S-matrix that describes this physical process to conserve energy and momentum, and moreover to be independent of the total momentum. We denote momentum of the two particles of species $j = A, B$ by $k_{j;1,2}$ where 1,2 labels particles 1 and 2 in the channel. The total momentum K is obviously

$$K = k_{j;1} + k_{j;2}. \tag{1}$$

Since we are considering a nonrelativistic problem, the energy can be written

$$E = \frac{1}{2M}\left(k_{j;1}^2 + k_{j;2}^2\right) + \Delta_j \tag{2}$$

where are $\Delta_j = 0$ for $j = A$ and $\Delta_j = \Delta$ for $j = B$. It is easy to see that

$$E = \frac{K^2}{2(2M)} + \frac{\kappa_j^2}{2\mu} + \Delta_j \tag{3}$$

where $\kappa_j = \frac{1}{2}(k_{j;1} - k_{j;2})$ is the relative momentum of the two particles of species j, and $\mu = M/2$ is the reduced mass. The asymptotic states that S is kinematically allowed to connect, therefore, have relative momenta related by

$$\kappa_k^2 = \kappa_j^2 - 2\mu\Delta_{jk}, \tag{4}$$

where we use the shorthand $\Delta_{jk} = \Delta_j - \Delta_k$.

Let us assume that the box is much larger than the range of the interaction between the particles. Then, in large spatial regions the energy eigenstates in the box will approximate well the asymptotic form. Because we are interested in periodic boundary conditions, outgoing asymptotic states will reach the box boundary and become incoming states on the opposite side of the box. The energy eigenstate are asymptotically of the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\, \Psi(E,K)\,\rangle_{\rm asy} = \sum_{j=A,B} \Big(& \alpha_j \,|\, \text{in}\,;\, j,\, \kappa_j,\; K\,\rangle \\ & + a_j \,|\, \text{out};\, j,\, \kappa_j,\; K\,\rangle \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the κ_j are related to E by Eq. (3) and "in" and "out" label the incoming and outgoing amplitudes respectively.

Now let us consider the action of S on asymptotic states. It relates the coefficients by

$$a_j = S(E,K)_{jk}\,\alpha_k. \tag{6}$$

Note the S depends *only* on the relative momenta; the dependence on E and K should be understood to be entirely through Eq. (3).

Of course, only wavefunctions with certain energies will fit in a box of given size, and these energies will be determined by the dynamics encapsulated in S. In position space, the pieces of this asymptotic wavefunction for channel j are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, j,\, x_1,\, x_2 \,|\, \text{in}\; j,\, \kappa_j,\; K\,\rangle_{\rm asy} &= \frac{e^{iKX}}{\sqrt{\kappa_j/\mu}}\left(e^{i\kappa_j x}\,\theta(-x) + e^{-i\kappa_j x}\,\theta(x)\right) \\ \langle\, j,\, x_1,\, x_2 \,|\, \text{out}\; j,\, \kappa_j,\; K\,\rangle_{\rm asy} &= \frac{e^{iKX}}{\sqrt{\kappa_j/\mu}}\left(e^{i\kappa_j x}\,\theta(x) + e^{-i\kappa_j x}\,\theta(-x)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where X is the location of the center of mass $\frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$ and $x = (x_1 - x_2)$ is the relative coordinate, θ is the usual

Heaviside step function, and the normalization is such that the incoming probability flux and outgoing probability flux are the same if S is unitary. Here, "asymptotic" is understood to mean that the magnitude of the relative coordinate x is much larger than range of the interaction. The symmetric form reflects the fact that the particles are identical bosons.

With these explicit asymptotic wavefunctions in hand, we note that Eq. (3) does not fix the sign of κ_j. Either sign is acceptable since it can be reabsorbed in the definitions of a_j and α_j; by convention we define κ_j to be positive.

Typical lattice simulations are performed with either periodic or twisted boundary conditions. So far as the issues of principle addressed in this paper are concerned, one may verify that twisted conditions offer no additional leverage for the problem of extracting S in this toy problem. In any event, they may be included with minimal effort. For simplicity we restrict our attention to simple periodic boundary conditions. If the box under consideration has spatial extent L, periodic boundary conditions imply that the wavefunction obeys

$$\left\langle -\frac{L}{2},\, x_2 \,\middle|\, \Psi(E,K) \right\rangle = \left\langle \frac{L}{2},\, x_2 \,\middle|\, \Psi(E,K) \right\rangle . \tag{8}$$

In particular, we can project this equality onto each channel and require the equality to hold separately for the pieces which depend on $\exp(ik_{j;1}x_2)$ and on $\exp(ik_{j;2}x_2)$. The $k_{j;1}$-dependent equality implies

$$a_j = \alpha_j e^{ik_{j;2}L} \tag{9}$$

while the $k_{j;2}$-dependent equality implies

$$a_j = \alpha_j e^{-ik_{j;1}L}. \tag{10}$$

By comparing these two equations we see that all channels imply the same quantization condition,

$$KL = 2\pi Z\,; \tag{11}$$

the integer Z characterizes the total momentum.

Note that in lattice simulations one can restrict attention to correlation functions of operators with a fixed known momentum and thus extract energy levels with a fixed known Z. We will assume that this can be done for this toy problem as well. In principle one can try extracting the S-matrix using a set of measurements at any fixed Z or a mixed set of Zs. Again, as far as issues of principle are concerned, this freedom gives no additional power for extracting information about S. We will henceforth assume Z is fixed and suppress dependence on the center of mass momentum K.

The relations between the coefficients of asymptotic incoming and outgoing wavefunction pieces for an energy eigenstate in Eqs. (9) and (10), along with Eq. (6), imply

$$\left(B_L^Z(E) - S(E)\right)\,\vec{\alpha} = 0, \tag{12}$$

where the boundary conditions were used to eliminate a_j in favor of α_j. The matrix B_L^Z is diagonal in the channels and enforces the boundary conditions:

$$B_L^Z(E) = (-1)^Z \begin{pmatrix} \exp(-i\kappa_A L) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-i\kappa_B L) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Note that B_L^Z depends on E and K only through the relative momenta and Z.

Equation (12) is of the form of a generalized eigenvector problem. For boxes much larger than the size of the interaction, energy eigenstates exist for those energies for which the matrix $\left(B_L^Z(E) - S(E)\right)$ has an eigenvector with eigenvalue zero. Of course, if a matrix has a zero eigenvalue, it also has a determinant of zero. Thus, the condition for an energy eigenstate for this toy problem to fit into a box of width L is equivalent to

$$\det\left[B_L^Z(E) - S(E,Z)\right] = 0. \tag{14}$$

Equation (14) should be regarded as a generalized Lüscher formula for this multi-channel toy problem. For any given S-matrix one can use it to determine the energy levels. Note that the result holds equally well for the case where the dynamics are relativistic: the only difference is that the κ_j are fixed by relativistic kinematics rather than non-relativistic kinematics.

We note that even though Eq. (14) was in a problem with only two channels, it immediately generalizes to any number of channels. In particular, it also contains the familiar one-dimensional two-body single-channel Lüscher formula.

III. A NO-GO THEOREM

In this section we address the question of whether it is possible to fully reconstruct the S-matrix for the toy problem from knowledge of the energy levels in finite boxes with periodic boundary conditions. To make the problem concrete, we assume that we know the energy levels as a function of box size for a finite range of box sizes. Given access to only such information about the dynamics, can one fully reconstruct the S-matrix for this system at some given energy? As will be shown, the answer is "no".

Suppose that all we knew about the dynamics for the two channel problem of the toy model is that it was quantum mechanical, then the only constraint we have for the S-matrix is that it is unitary: $S \in U(2)$ at each energy. The most general $U(2)$ matrix can be specified by 4 angle variables; a useful parameterization of S is:

$$S(E) = e^{i\phi(E)} e^{i\theta(E)\hat{n}(E)\cdot\vec{\sigma}} \tag{15}$$

where $\vec{\sigma}$ represents the usual Pauli matrices and the energy-dependent unit vector $\hat{n}$ can be parameterized by

$$\hat{n} = \sin(\alpha)\cos(\beta)\hat{x} + \sin(\alpha)\sin(\beta)\hat{y} + \cos(\alpha)\hat{z}, \tag{16}$$

where we have suppressed the energy dependence through Eq. (3) of $\hat{n}$, α, and β for clarity. Thus specifying $S(E)$ is equivalent to specifying ϕ, θ, α and β as functions of energy; specifying the S-matrix at one energy merely requires these functions' values at that energy. Note, moreover, that the structure of Eq. (15) is such that under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\to \phi & \theta &\to 2\pi - \theta \\ \alpha &\to \pi - \alpha & \beta &\to \beta + \pi \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

the S-matrix is unchanged. This allows us to choose as a convention a restricted range of the parameters: $0 \le \phi < 2\pi$, $0 \le \theta < 2\pi$, $0 \le \alpha < \pi$ and $-\pi/2 \le \beta < \pi/2$.

It is easy to show that the energy levels given by the generalized Lüscher formula of Eq. (14) are completely independent of the parameter β. This means that it is impossible to determine $\beta(E)$ from knowledge of the energy levels and hence impossible to determine the S-matrix.

To see why the energy levels do not depend on β, consider the energy-dependent diagonal matrix

$$D(E) = \exp(i\chi(E)\sigma_3) \tag{18}$$

where $\chi(E)$ is a general energy-dependent function that specifies $D(E)$. From the multiplicative property of the determinant and the unitary nature of D, it follows that if $\det\left[B_L^Z(E) - S(E)\right]$ vanishes, then $\det\left[D^\dagger(E)\left(B_L^Z(E) - S(E)\right)D(E)\right]$ does too. Moreover, since $B_L^Z(E)$ is diagonal it commutes with $D(E)$. Thus, whenever Eq. (14) holds for S-matrix $S(E)$ for some given box size L, it also holds for

$$S'(E) \equiv D^\dagger S(E) D. \tag{19}$$

It is easy to see that $S'(E)$ is related to $S(E)$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(E) &= \phi(E) & \theta'(E) &= \theta(E) \\ \alpha'(E) &= \alpha(E) & \beta'(E) &= \beta(E) + 2\chi(E)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Equation (20) implies that the β parameter can be shifted by an arbitrary energy-dependent amount without affecting the energy levels for any box size, provided that the boxes are large enough for the generalized Lüscher formula to hold. Clearly the the energy levels alone are insufficient to determine $\beta(E)$ and hence the S-matrix cannot be fully specified.

It is worth noting that the parameter β is associated with time-reveral-nonivariant dynamics: for $\beta = 0$ the S-matrix is symmetric but otherwise the S-matrix is generically not symmetric. It is well known[28] that the S-matrix is symmetric for theories in which the dynamics is T-symmetric.

Thus, while there is a no-go theorem for fully determining the S-matrix for the most general case of dynamics, it may appear that it is evaded if one knows that the dynamics of the system is T-symmetric since for T-symmetric theories one can simply set β to zero at the outset. However, that is not the case. There remains a discrete ambiguity even in the T-symmetric case. Suppose that we begin with an S-matrix $S(E)$ with $\beta = 0$ that satisfies the generalized Lüscher formula. Next, we pick D by choosing $\chi(E)$ to be $-\pi/2$ for all E. Such a transformation keeps S-matrix symmetric. In that case we know from the argument above that $S'(E) \equiv D^\dagger S(E) D$ will have identical energies for all boxes large enough for the generalized Lüscher formula to apply. Using Eq. (20) and Eq. (17) one sees that relationship between the parameters of $S'(E)$ and $S(E)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(E) &= \phi(E) & \theta'(E) &= 2\pi - \theta(E) \\ \alpha'(E) &= \pi - \alpha(E) & \beta'(E) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

As advertised this is a valid symmetric matrix with $\beta = 0$ which is physically distinct from $S(E)$ provided that both θ and α are nonzero. The nature of this discrete ambiguity is that of a sign ambiguity for the off-diagonal matrix elements of S.

To summarize, in the context of this simple toy model we have shown that it is not possible to fully specify the S-matrix given a complete knowledge of the energy levels in finite boxes with periodic boundary conditions.

While this no-go theorem was derived for this simplest of toy models, it is easy to see that holds more generally. It trivially generalizes to any 1+1 dimensional model with two-body scattering with either relativistic or non-relativistic kinematics and any number of channels. In this more general context, the number of distinct S-matrices with identical energy levels in a box and T-invariant dynamics is 2^{n-1} where n is the number of channels. An analogous no-go theorem in the 3+1 dimensional case will be more cumbersome to prove because of the mixing of partial waves due to box boundary conditions but there is every reason to believe that such a theorem will exist.

This no-go theorem implies that one cannot *fully* reconstruct the S-matrix for multi-channel problems from a knowledge of energy levels in finite boxes with periodic boundary conditions. However, it remains possible that interesting and important information about the S-matrix may be extracted. For example, in the case of T-invariant dynamics, one might hope to fully determine the S-matrix with high accuracy modulo the discrete ambiguity imposed by the no-go theorem. Such a determination would allow one to answer questions such as: given incident particles in channel A, what is the probability that they will emerge in channel B? In a forthcoming paper we explore algorithms of this kind and discuss the serious technical challenges implementing such an algorithm for lattice QCD.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank U.S. Deptartment of Energy for support under grant #DE-DG02-93ER-40762. E. B. also thanks Jefferson Science Associates for support under the JSA/JLab Graduate Fellowship program. We thank Thomas Loomis for valuable discussion.

---

[1] PoS(LATTICE2011), Proceedings of Lattice 2011 (2011), URL http://pos.sissa.it/cgi-bin/reader/conf.cgi?confid=139.
[2] H. Hamber, E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and C. Rebbi, Physics Letters B **124**, 99 (1983), ISSN 0370-2693.
[3] M. Lüscher, Communications in Mathematical Physics **104**, 177 (1986), ISSN 0010-3616, 10.1007/BF01211589.
[4] M. Lüscher, Communications in Mathematical Physics **105**, 153 (1986), ISSN 0010-3616, 10.1007/BF01211097.
[5] U.-J. Wiese, Nuclear Physics B - Proceedings Supplements **9**, 609 (1989), ISSN 0920-5632.
[6] M. Lüscher, Nuclear Physics B **354**, 531 (1991), ISSN 0550-3213.
[7] M. Lüscher, Nuclear Physics B **364**, 237 (1991), ISSN 0550-3213.
[8] C. Pelissier and A. Alexandru (2012), 1211.0092.
[9] X. Feng, K. Jansen, and D. B. Renner (ETMC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **83**, 094505 (2011).
[10] D. M. S. Prelovsek, C. B. Lang and M. Vidmar (2011), 1111.0409.
[11] S. Aoki, K.-I. Ishikawa, N. Ishizuka, K. Kanaya, Y. Kuramashi, Y. Namekawa, M. Okawa, Y. Taniguchi, A. Ukawa, N. Ukita, et al. (PACS-CS Collaboratin), Phys. Rev. D **84**, 094505 (2011).
[12] D. Guadagnoli, M. Papinutto, and S. Simula, Physics Letters B **604**, 74 (2004), ISSN 0370-2693.
[13] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards, N. Mathur, and D. G. Richards, Phys.Rev. **D77**, 034501 (2008), 0707.4162.
[14] S. Basak, R. Edwards, G. Fleming, K. Juge, A. Lichtl, et al., Phys.Rev. **D76**, 074504 (2007), 0709.0008.
[15] J. M. Bulava, R. G. Edwards, E. Engelson, J. Foley, B. Joo, et al., Phys.Rev. **D79**, 034505 (2009), 0901.0027.
[16] J. J. Dudek, R. Edwards, and C. E. Thomas, Phys.Rev. **D79**, 094504 (2009), 0902.2241.
[17] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards, M. J. Peardon, D. G. Richards, and C. E. Thomas, Phys.Rev.Lett. **103**, 262001 (2009), 0909.0200.
[18] M. Mahbub, A. . Cais, W. Kamleh, B. G. Lasscock, D. B. Leinweber, and A. G. Williams, Physics Letters B **679**, 418 (2009), ISSN 0370-2693.
[19] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards, M. J. Peardon, D. G. Richards, and C. E. Thomas, Phys.Rev. **D82**, 034508 (2010), 1004.4930.
[20] V. Bernard, M. Lage, U.-G. Meissner, and A. Rusetsky, JHEP **1101**, 019 (2011), 1010.6018.
[21] R. G. Edwards, J. J. Dudek, D. G. Richards, and S. J. Wallace, Phys.Rev. **D84**, 074508 (2011), 1104.5152.
[22] L. Liu et al. (for the Hadron Spectrum Collaboration), JHEP **1207**, 126 (2012), 1204.5425.
[23] Beringer, J. *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
[24] K. Polejaeva and A. Rusetsky, The European Physical Journal A - Hadrons and Nuclei **48**, 1 (2012), ISSN 1434-6001, 10.1140/epja/i2012-12067-8.
[25] M. Lage, U.-G. Meissner, and A. Rusetsky, Phys.Lett. **B681**, 439 (2009), 0905.0069.
[26] M. T. Hansen and S. R. Sharpe, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 016007 (2012), 1204.0826.
[27] V. Bernard, D. Hoja, U.-G. Meiner, and A. Rusetsky, Journal of High Energy Physics **2012**, 1 (2012), ISSN 1029-8479, 10.1007/JHEP09(2012)023.
[28] F. Coester, Phys. Rev. **89**, 619 (1953).